

JPRS 74223

21 September 1979

East Europe Report

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No.1717



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available from Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		1. REPORT NO. JPRS 74223	3. Recipient's Accession No.																		
4. Title and Subtitle EAST EUROPE REPORT: POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL, AND MILITARY AFFAIRS, No. 1717		5. Report Date 21 September 1979																			
7. Author(s)		6.																			
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201		8. Performing Organization Rept. No.																			
		10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.																			
		11. Contract(C) or Grant(G) No. (C) (G)																			
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address As above		13. Type of Report & Period Covered																			
		14.																			
15. Supplementary Notes																					
16. Abstract (Limit: 200 words) This serial report contains information on official party and government pronouncements and writings on significant domestic political developments; information on general sociological problems and developments in such areas as demography, manpower, public health and welfare, education, and mass organizations; and articles on military and civil defense, organization, theory, budgets, and hardware.																					
17. Document Analysis a. Descriptors <table border="0"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> International Affairs</td> <td>Propaganda</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Albania</td> <td>Political Science</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Bulgaria</td> <td>Sociology</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Czechoslovakia</td> <td>Military Organizations</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> German Democratic Republic</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Hungary</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poland</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Romania</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yugoslavia</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>				<input type="checkbox"/> International Affairs	Propaganda	<input type="checkbox"/> Albania	Political Science	<input type="checkbox"/> Bulgaria	Sociology	<input type="checkbox"/> Czechoslovakia	Military Organizations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> German Democratic Republic		<input type="checkbox"/> Hungary		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poland		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Romania		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yugoslavia	
<input type="checkbox"/> International Affairs	Propaganda																				
<input type="checkbox"/> Albania	Political Science																				
<input type="checkbox"/> Bulgaria	Sociology																				
<input type="checkbox"/> Czechoslovakia	Military Organizations																				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> German Democratic Republic																					
<input type="checkbox"/> Hungary																					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poland																					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Romania																					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yugoslavia																					
b. Identifiers/Open Ended Terms																					
c. COSATI Field/Group 5D, 5K, 15																					
18. Availability Statement Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22161		19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 51																		
		20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	22. Price																		

21 September 1979

EAST EUROPE REPORT

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

No. 1717

CONTENTS	PAGE
 GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC	
West, East Interpretations of Security Concept Discussed (Hans Pirsch, Karl Pagel; IPW-BERICHT, Jul 79)	1
New Type of Small Patrol Boat Described (Dieter Rieken; VOLKSARMEE, Aug 79)	15
 POLAND	
ROPCO Activist Moczulski Creates New 'Political Party' (DZIENNIK POLSKI, 3, 4, 6 Sep 79)	17
'Democratic Confederation' Created Despite Arrests, Rally Held Seeks End of Soviet Domination	
 ROMANIA	
Foreign Policy Concerns Reviewed by Foreign Minister (Stefan Andrei; ERA SOCIALISTA, 20 Aug 79)	21
Criticism of Geography Textbook Refuted (Claudiu Giurcaneanu; ERA SOCIALISTA, 20 Aug 79)	34
Changes Suggested in Awarding of Literary Prizes (Valeriu Rapeanu Interview; CONTEMPORANUL, 20 Jul 79) .	39
 YUGOSLAVIA	
Meaning of Party Membership Viewed (Viktor Tsvetanoski; NOVA MAKEDONIA, 19 Aug 79)	42

CONTENTS (Continued)

Page

Party Press Scores Vranicki Book and 'Uncritical' Reviews (KOMUNIST, 17 Aug 79)	44
Controversy Surrounds Anthology, Linguistic Study (Editorial Report)	47

WEST, EAST INTERPRETATIONS OF SECURITY CONCEPT DISCUSSED

East Berlin IPW-BERICHTE in German Vol 8 No 7, Jul 79 pp 8-15

[Article by Hans Pirsch, with the collaboration of Karl Pagel: "Imperialist Falsification of the Idea of Security: Abuse of the Security Interests of the People--Assault at the Heart of the Policy of Peaceful Coexistence--Diversion from the Struggle Against the Arms Race--Policy Against Social Progress"]

[Text] The concept of security has been under discussion in imperialist circles for some time. Involved in it, as the driving force, mainly are conservatives, but representatives of other fractions of the bourgeoisie as well. The discussion is going on among those imperialist forces that have a considerable influence on the economy, politics and ideology and especially also on the military and the armaments industry. This debate has meanwhile reached a stage where a greatly modified definition that falsifies the nature of the security concept is becoming visible. In parallel with it, so-called security policy measures are being contemplated and practiced in the imperialist camp that are clearly reactionary and anti-detente. These processes amount to a reaction to the growing instability of imperialism and to an attempt "at stopping the process of improvement in international relations, even turning it in the opposite direction."¹

Aggressive Intentions Under the Cover of "Security"

Formerly the concept of security was, for all intents and purposes, defined even by imperialist circles under the aspect of national security from military aggression from the outside, even though the attempt also has always been made at justifying reactionary operations within and outside by allegedly national security interests. Today, however, the security definition of bourgeois ideologists and politicians embraces the processes in all essential sociopolitical fields, with regard both to foreign and domestic policy. It includes developments in their own country as well as in practically all countries in the world. By security these forces mean not the security of the life of the people but a guarantee for the existence of the capitalist social order, including that of the "defense" of that system and even its restoration where it no longer exists. In the security definitions as now

publicized the military aspects, which continue to play a role of the first rank, are being supplemented by other considerations. Accordingly, insuring security requires the consolidation of the political power of monopoly capital directed at the outside and the expansion of the sets of instruments, means and methods, needed for it; the maintenance and solidification of the internal imperialist power relations; including the production relations based on exploitation and the unobstructed continuation of economic expansion and neocolonialist exploitation as the essential basis for imperialist rule; the guarantee for the decisive influence by the ruling imperialist ideology on the broadest possible circles of the people's masses, an increasingly more important component of the imperialist exercise of power within and outside; and a counterrevolutionary interference with the domestic affairs of other states, including military intervention, which is aimed against progressive aspirations, social progress and revolutionary changes, shows contempt for the peoples' right to self-determination, and subjects the international atmosphere to perilous tensions.

Thus the ruling monopoly capitalist circles are defining the security concept in such a way that they can thereby openly practice, and ideologically "justify," a "security policy" causing complex sociopolitical effects in the sense of preserving the capitalist power relations and expanding or restoring them in that part of the world which has already been changed by revolution. Therein precisely lies the danger of this imperialist falsification of the security concept.

Some statements by bourgeois forces will make this clear. For instance, Count Wolf von Baudissin of the FRG writes: "It is becoming ever more apparent that security policy that finally turns into confrontation is going to become increasingly more complex and complicated. . . . Furthermore, raw material and energy crises, terrorism and other phenomena demonstrate how the security of societies can be massively jeopardized, with relatively low risks for those who do the threatening, even by nonmilitary means. And so, security policy also will have to deal with other matters, not last with the need for social reforms and a fundamental reorganization of relations between north and south."² "Security" policy, as we see here, mainly is meant to protect imperialism from all alleged threats. In the final analysis, of course, from the historic process of its replacement by a social order free from exploitation and suppression.

Instead of Security, a Free Hand for Imperialist Policy

A book published in the FRG draws the following remarkable consequences from the outcome of CSCE: "Security policy in the traditional sense defined exclusively the military national security from threats and intervention from outside. Today, security requires coping with many different external--and no longer merely military--influences. The military aspect, to be sure, remains the centerpiece of security policy, yet it is being modified in its significance and structure by interconnections with other political areas that are relevant to security." And then it goes on to say security policy

should, "as it were, meet today, along with the military threat in the east-west relationship, economic dangers from the recession, high fuel dependency and problems from an increasing north-south conflict. Classical security policy must therefore be expanded by means of a flexible set of instruments making possible both its accommodating to, and its own effects on, essential changes in the international system."³

FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE contributed to this discussion an especially frank call for meddling in the internal affairs of other, that is to say, the socialist, countries: "Europe's security problem today . . . lies in having to construct and maintain high deformation pressures on the Soviet system."⁴

On the other hand, imperialist security policy is meant to screen off the exploiter system from any kind of social progress. In the concluding communiqué of the NATO summit conference of 30 and 31 May 1978, the states participating in this aggressive military pact unequivocally include the preservation of the social relations prevailing in their countries among the tasks of NATO because, as it is stated there, these "democratic government systems . . . provide the most humane and effective means for guiding society."⁵

Not only preserving imperialist power relations in the NATO states but also bolstering them in other parts of the world against any progressive social policy is the objective of the NATO "security policy." That is reflected in the designs at forming a "highly mobile global armed force" ready to be used in Africa or other parts of the world against the anti-imperialist national liberation movement and against revolutionary socialist developments.

Especially U.S. imperialism, by means of a security formula understood in an expansionist manner like that, aims at nothing else but justifying a policy that jeopardizes the detente process by infringing the peoples' sovereignty and right to self-determination, a policy of reactionary and counterrevolutionary interference in the domestic affairs of other states, by which it means to secure its power positions and maintain or restore the capitalist system of government in the various parts of the world. The security advisor of the U.S. President, Zbigniew Brzezinski, clearly stated that in an interview, on 1 January 1979, in the NEW YORK TIMES MAGAZINE: "Today national security in the broadest sense means an active and positive commitment by the United States in shaping a rapidly changing world in a way that would conform with our own interests and our own relevant ideas of values."

That this also connects with gaining or maintaining important military strategic positions and with the neocolonialist policy of exploitation and suppression had unmistakably been expressed previously by U.S. Secretary of Defense Harold Brown: "The gigantic African continent merits attention not only because of its strategically important geographic location but also because of its increasing value as a raw material source. . . . Assuring access to the African raw materials is becoming more and more important for the United States."⁶

The utterances quoted here indicate that any reactionary and aggressive stance and, in fact, the grossest violations of international law and the most dangerous assaults on the detente process could be "justified" by what the imperialist side imputes to the concept of national security. The bourgeois ideologues and politicians are on purpose mixing up two different things. State relations are held to be equal with the overall class struggle in the world. A guarantee they want against the growing instability of the imperialist system of government which principally results from the objective effect of the contradictions that are inherent in that society. State relations and general class struggle are, however, two different levels in international development. While they cannot be separated absolutely from one another, their borderlines must be kept unblurred more than ever.

It is possible and necessary to secure state relations based on peaceful co-existence and to settle their controversies peacefully without creating the kind of tensions in the international atmosphere that would cause the risk of moving mankind to the brink of an infernal war conducted with horrifying weapons of mass annihilation. The meaning of and need for the process of detente are found precisely in that the problems of social development that have ripened for humanity can be solved without imperialist aggressive wars. It requires respect for the basic principles of international law. Expanding the concept of national security to include the safeguarding of the exploiter system against the exploited classes and strata, as imperialist circles would have it, implies a policy that runs against those principles, however. In particular, the imperialist efforts at undermining social progress in the various countries by international activities like those of NATO are apt to produce perilous tensions in international state relations and to make peace less secure. This expansion of the security concept actually is its falsification. The effect it produces is the very opposite of national security, is international insecurity, insecurity for all states on the earth.

The reasons for the definitions discussed here, for expanding and falsifying the definition of security by imperialist circles, are diametrically opposed to the interests men have in preserving peace, consolidating detente and starting disarmament, and democratic and social progress. This is intended to divert from the processes of deep crises within the capitalist world, to gloss over the increasing instability of the imperialist system of government. This "security" argumentation has the purpose of disguising reactionary domestic and foreign policy designs by imperialist forces. And, above all, the various explanations given for the "security formulas" they have found now, and for the "security policy" measures derived from them, make clear that rather than enhancing security at the international scale, the risk of reducing the level of international security obtained is increased thereby.

Military Mobilization Meant To Be Justified by the Anticomunist Theory About a Threat

On top of all the arguments for a stronger and more comprehensive imperialist "security policy" continues to stand the claim of an alleged threat against

the West by the Soviet Union or the Warsaw Pact states. In his state of the union message, U.S. President Carter justified the aggressive imperialist military policy by an alleged threat from the East and a deterrence derived therefrom, a need in contradiction with realities. He said: "Our deterrence is overwhelming." And he went even further than that. With regard to the main thrust of the military potential of the United States, he announced, provocatively: "A single one of our relatively invulnerable Poseidon submarines, for example, has . . . a sufficient number of warheads for destroying every large and medium-size city in the Soviet Union." He emphasized he would want to engage in a policy that would guarantee for the U.S. "potential of deterrence" to remain "overwhelming" and demanded approval for a budget focused on "military strength."⁷ Thus it is not the security for human existence but quite evidently the military superiority of imperialism which is the goal of this policy. And this threat comes, not from the Soviet Union, but from U.S. imperialism.

Yet even in official NATO documents, the lie of the threat by the Soviet Union constantly recurs. Thus the NATO Council communique of the Washington Conference pretends there is a steady "expansion of the offensive potential of the Warsaw Pact."⁸ The communique of the conference of the NATO planning commission of 5 and 6 December 1978 claims the Soviet armed forces had already "exceeded the scope needed for defense."⁹ And the basic CDU program now in effect talks of an alleged "threat by the Warsaw Pact."¹⁰ The fact is that such a threat against the capitalist world by the socialist community and its military pact does not exist. That legend belongs in the arsenal of psychological warfare, to which the most aggressive forces of imperialism, especially of NATO, have been resorting time and time again in recent years in order to torpedo the process of detente.¹¹ The Politburo report to the ninth SED Central Committee session states: "The imperialists are escalating the arms race and more and more conduct the ideological struggle between the two social systems by means of diversion and interference in the internal affairs of other states. Such practice is opposed to detente."¹²

In his state of the union message, Carter sought to justify the arms race the imperialists are escalating by pretending America's military strength was a main force for security and stability in the world, from which he derived the alleged need for further military mobilization, for the enormous boosting of military expenditures. The last 30 years have shown, however, that the security in the international arena has not been improved by the steady escalation of the armaments and military potential of NATO. On the contrary, the armaments policy conducted by the imperialists has intensified the confrontation, always contained the risk that the cold war would turn into a military conflict, and encumbered the working people's standard of living as much as the economies all around.

If, even so, there is more security today, it is attributable to the grown influence of socialism in the world. Its all round strengthening, including the growth of its military forces, has, through collaboration with all other peace-loving forces in the world, made peace more secure. The advances achieved in international relations have primarily been initiated by the

socialist community of states and its heartland, the USSR. Also in the field of arms limitation, it is especially the USSR which time and again is taking steps, not only by means of constructive suggestions, resolutions and measures that could be agreed upon among the states and lead to practical disarmament, but also in the form of limiting the share armaments costs take up in the USSR budget, which could set a model example. Only recently the Warsaw Pact member states, through their Moscow Declaration, have proven once again they pursue a program that conforms with the interests of peaceful people all over the world.

In spite of these real facts, bourgeois ideologues keep trying to shore up this lie of a threat on theoretic grounds too. John Kenneth Galbraith--one of the most prominent bourgeois social scientists--points out in his most recent book that there is a trend of thought in the camp of imperialist ideologues and politicians which proceeds from that there exists "an undissoluble conflict between mutually hostile economic, political and social systems"¹³ from which they derive the unavoidability of war and thus intend to justify the imperialist arms race.

Even bourgeois ideologists admit the Soviet Union seeks no war and no export of the revolution. The noted U.S. diplomat George F. Kennan, for instance, writes about the attitude of the communists led by Lenin after the Red October of 1917: "Revolution as they understood it had to evolve primarily from the actions of the revolutionary proletariat indigenous to any given country. True enough, revolutionary Russia could assist those proletarian forces in other countries by fraternal aid moral, material and military in kind, to the extent it was possible. But that such support should substitute for the revolutionary activities of the indigenous proletariat in the countries in question was never considered."¹⁴

The revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism at a world scale is a process that is objectively conditioned. Today, the material prerequisites being available for it, it is taking place to the extent that the working class becomes aware of its task in this process. This amounts to class relations, to the struggle among the main classes in capitalist society, to the struggle of all three main revolutionary currents against imperialism. This objectively conditioned class conflict cannot be suspended. But the danger of nuclear world war, that would jeopardize the survival of mankind as such, can be averted through the common efforts of all progressive forces. CPSU Central Committee Secretary B. N. Ponomarev writes about this: "No one is more decisively and fundamentally against war than the communists are, because the wars, by which a handful of monopolists enrich themselves, bring misery, hardship and suffering for the working people. Social revolution is not generated by war--that was thoroughly proven by Marxism-Leninism. It is the consequence and outcome of the working of the objective laws of historic development, of the antagonistic contradictions of the capitalist system and of the class struggle. . . . Abolishing war and insuring eternal peace in the world--that is the historic mission and program goal of communism."¹⁵

Socialist States: Excluding War as a Means of Politics

Developing the relations between socialist and capitalist states under the current conditions of military science and technology, because of the danger threatening the survival of humanity, is possible only by excluding that means of politics. Realistic forces in the bourgeois camp recognize that too. Galbraith, for instance, writes one has to work together with the USSR to remove the threat against all life. "A matter of common sense it is to make the prevention of nuclear war the supreme goal of politics in both countries. The common interest in that objective is much more important than are all the differences in the economic and political systems of the United States and the Soviet Union."¹⁶

G. F. Kennan, one of the cofounders of the cold war strategy after World War II, writes about the theory on the "threat from the East" with regard to the USSR: "planning an attack against Western Europe would be the last thing it could think of."¹⁷

In a remarkable manner also Dieter S. Lutz of the Hamburg Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy turns against the lie of the Soviet threat. He points out that it was the United States that first had and used the atomic bomb, that U.S. long-range bombers were introduced in 1953 and the Soviet Union only 4 years later put long-range bombers into operation. More or less the same applies to ICBM's, nuclear submarines, and submarine missiles launched under water, multiple warhead missiles and those with individual guidance systems. The fact is that the time sequence in armaments innovations during the last decades demonstrates the United States always was the one to have propelled the arms race.¹⁸

The USSR, as a socialist state, is not interested in escalating this dread in order thereby to maintain military equilibrium. It rather seeks to terminate it and to insure much more security, by disarmament and on the premise of equal security and the preservation of the military balance on a lower level, than would be possible by pushing further ahead with armaments. Moreover, the eager proponents of the threat theory contradict each other. Whenever they want to demonstrate their "strength" or must reassure the capitalist society, after anticommunist agitation has made it unsure of itself, the sounds they then make are entirely different. Then suddenly, they assever, as if they had never asserted anything different, there is no reason for disquiet because the West was presumably superior to the Warsaw Pact. U.S. Secretary of Defense Harold Brown, for instance, has announced: "As to conventional weapons, there are some conditions and capacities where they are ahead of us and some other in which we are ahead. . . All in all, I would think that, essentially, we have comparability in all these matters; but in a purely military respect, I should like to add, the United States is significantly ahead."¹⁹ And even NATO Supreme Commander Alexander Haig has admitted: "When one talks about number of troops--all in all, ours are one and a half time larger than those of the Warsaw Pact."²⁰

The lies about the "threat from the East" thus turn out to be maneuvers by imperialist forces for igniting the international situation and further escalating the arms race spiral propelled by imperialism. The constant dissemination of this lie at the same time contradicts the intention announced in the Final Act of Helsinki of promoting a climate of trust in the international arena.

The "justification" of imperialist mobilization and the alleged need for deterrence through lies like that does not make the situation more secure, as postwar history teaches us. Not security, but fear and distrust is what is being produced. They in turn are used for creating ever new NATO long-range armaments programs and dangerous mass destruction weapons. The lie about the "threat from the East" is, in truth, aimed against international security.

Demagogic Misuse of the Human Rights Concept

Among the most dangerous reasons for expanding the imperialist "security concept" also is the deliberate distortion of the human rights concept.

Insuring real human rights and basic freedoms within the states is of course an essential component of international relations that is also expressed in the UN resolutions. Imperialist circles, however, evoke dangerous trends in the development of international relations by encouraging fascist and other reactionary regimes to engage in gross and massive human rights violations, overtly or covertly supporting their anti-human policy, permitting human rights violations to occur in their own country and, allegedly in defense of human rights, meddling with the internal affairs of the socialist states and other countries. Through the instigation of individuals who have violated the law in their countries, imperialist circles seek to encourage counterrevolutionary activities against the socialist social order and to engage in them actively themselves.

Such activities lead back to the times of the cold war. Cold war, constant balancing acts on the edge of a hot war, give the lie, however, to the intentions of those people who are conducting militant human rights campaigns today. In their own country they are trampling human rights under foot, ready to sacrifice, not only the human rights, but the people themselves to counterrevolutionary imperialist class goals, to expansion and aggression. The insincerity of the human rights campaign becomes all the more apparent by that especially those who are making so much noise about alleged human rights violations in socialism could do a great deal in the capitalist countries in fighting against race discrimination, unemployment, political oppression, exploitation and the violation of other nations' sovereign rights.

The Declaration of the Warsaw Pact states emphatically underlines the fact that socialism guarantees the respect for the political, civic, economic, social, cultural and other rights and the access by all members of society to work, education, culture and science, and participation in government.

Verbatim it says: "The desire to realize the basic right of man--the right to an existence in human dignity, without exploitation--and create the prerequisites for the all round development of personality arose with the new social order. Socialism carries the banner of human rights and freedoms."²¹

Social security is a reality in socialism. No one here is fearful of the bases of his existence. The citizens in socialist states avail themselves of political rights and fulfill political duties as in no previous social system. In socialism, education, culture and the intellectual life reach a level of which the humanists in all previous eras could only dream. This is all the more significant in that it is not confined, as it was in all presocialist forms of society, to an elite but applies to all people in society. For imperialism to derive from that fact an alleged violation of human rights and basic freedoms in socialist states and design a "security problem" out of it is pure demagogy and aims at nothing else but subjecting the international atmosphere to new tension.

Neocolonialism and the Hostility to Progress

Also those arguments that are presenting the alleged supply risks in raw materials and fuels as a danger to the national security of industrialized capitalist countries and are now publicly demanding "security policy measures" to avert that "danger" are putting things upside-down, are not producing security but evoking insecurity.

The recommended solution for the "north-south conflict" by means of a "security policy," such as expanding the competency of NATO into Africa, constitutes a very dangerous ideological and political design that contradicts reality and is motivated by neocolonialist ambitions and practices.

This is not the place to deal with all the causes and the whole background of the raw material and fuel crisis, produced to a large extent by capitalism itself.²² One of the causes of the difficulties capitalist states are encountering in this field, as is indeed well known, lies in the neocolonialist manner in which they have dealt with those countries that have abundant raw materials but could not develop their own processing industry because of centuries of colonial suppression. No wonder that these peoples are becoming aware of their rights of disposition over those natural resources and enlist their position of strength in the defense against neocolonialist suppression and exploitation.

A new and just international economic order,²³ opposed particularly by the reactionary circles of monopoly capital, could reduce much stress there. Prerequisite to it, however, is the recognition and support of democratic and just demands for national sovereignty, equality and the reorganization of international economic relations on a democratic basis. International big capital, however, wants the opposite. For reasons of so-called national security--while the real point in question is the security of profits--it arrogates the right to secure its raw material sources, if need be, even by military means. This "security policy" plainly comes down to securing capitalist spheres of influence and social relations and preventing progressive,

anti-imperialist and democratic and socialist developments in Africa and elsewhere in the world. The Moscow Declaration points to the danger in those endeavors emphasizing that imperialist policy also, "as aimed against the peoples fighting for their independence and social progress, is a source of danger to international detente."²⁴

This fact also was underscored in the joint communique on negotiations between socialist Ethiopia and the GDR. This is what is stated there: "The heads of both delegations resolutely condemn the increasing attempts of interference by the NATO states in the internal affairs of African states. They are aimed at halting and reversing the process of national and social liberation and constitute a danger to world peace and international security."²⁵

Trend Toward Militarization

Another set of justifications for the imperialist expansion of the security concept meets the eye in the definitions referred to above. These are those arguments by which comprehensive "security policy" measures are deduced for coping with crisis-ridden economic developments, the recession, social and domestic exacerbations, the shoring up of present government systems in the NATO countries and so forth, and by which the attempt is made, for example, to subordinate more directly also the so-called reform policy to the "security policy." That actually includes the entire economic, social and domestic areas in the security policy sphere. Yet all the crisis manifestations of the capitalist economy and the imperialist system of government, as well as the growing class struggles in the capitalist countries, result from the internal contradictions of the capitalist system, even though they also are under the effect of external factors. The definition of the security concept--and thus its falsification--, expanded into these contradictions, is meant to furnish an ideological and political justification for the tendency toward militarizing all domains of public life, a trend resulting from the very nature of imperialism. It offers the forces of the military-industrial complex the opportunity for strengthening their influence on the policy of imperialist states and boosting their activities which in an ominous manner are directed against the process of detente.

Remarkable Continuity in the Nature of Reaction

The ruling imperialist forces have always sought to defend and realize their power and aspirations for domination internally and externally by any means at all. And their rationale has also been in the past this alleged need for safeguarding security.

In that sense the representatives of German capital regarded the Paris Commune as a danger to their security and took part in defeating the Communards through military force. The triumphant socialist October Revolution was no less seen as a danger to the security of 21 imperialist states, although the first word of the new social order was peace and absolutely no aggressive intentions against other states came, or were to be expected, from the Soviet power. But evidently because of that, international imperialism united for violent military intervention.

Stations within this continuity that were particularly reactionary in nature have been the U.S. war crimes against the heroic Vietnamese people and the ongoing endeavors by the United States and NATO to suppress progressive movements in Africa, Latin America and elsewhere in the world in various ways and means and with reference to alleged security dangers for the United States or the NATO states.

Nor is there anything new in capital's using the most brutal means on behalf of its control over raw materials and fuels. Along with reactionary political goals, economic power and profit interests in particular have always been the background for imperialist wars of aggression. That was especially true of German imperialism in World Wars I and II.

Nor is there anything new in rationalizing reactionary measures for securing imperialist domination in terms of domestic policy, economic and cultural policy and in socioeconomic terms. From the Cologne communist trial in 1852 via the socialist law, McCarthyism, the bloody terror of the fascists all the way to many suppression measures in domestic policy practiced by big capital today, mostly coupled with diversified maneuvers in other areas, this highly differentiated development of the reactionary and militant nature of imperialism can be seen in its continuity.

In his 27 April 1907 speech in Leipzig on "Militarism and Antimilitarism," Karl Liebknecht had pointed to the internal and external function of militarism as it springs from the exploiter society.²⁶ Even before that, he had stated "that militarism is a highly complex and intertwined phenomenon suffusing all possible areas of our economic, social and political life" and that it "is the most important of those brutal power mechanisms by which the ruling class of capitalist society seeks to forcefully oppose continued organic development and can thereby to a certain extent block such a development against democracy and the will of the majority of the people."²⁷

This class-bound nature of militarism also is basic to today's endeavors at expanding the security concept. New in this development is the formation of a compact imperialist "security definition," by which in a modified manner precisely this class-bound quality is to be disguised and the reactionary foreign and domestic policy endeavors, especially of those imperialist circles that belong to the military-industrial complex, are meant to be justified. The ideology and policy serving the realization of those goals encounter very different conditions today, however.

No longer single states or some allies, but large and partly allied groups and blocks of states are opposing each other today. The outbreak of military aggression, as it is meant to be justified by the falsification of the security concept, would no longer embroil merely two or several states in military conflict. Today the whole world can be in a state of war at once. Weapons of mass destruction have immeasurably increased the danger of possible aggressive acts by imperialism. The insanity of an imperialist aggressive war has assumed an immense potential. Unless opposed by all reasonable and realistic

persons interested in peace and in the normal development of international relations, it harbors the possibility for escalating international tensions until they will make a war break out that would reduce human society to near zero, both with respect to the number of survivors and their developmental level.

The "security theory" treated here and the practical "security policy" aspirations derived from it obviously belong the activities of those imperialist forces that are "trying to subject independent states and nations under their domination, heat up the arms race and grossly interfere in the internal affairs of other states. All that," as the Moscow Declaration puts it, "jeopardizes the process of detente and opposes the nations' desire for peace, freedom, independence and progress."²⁸

The reactionary and anti-detente manifestations, endangering international security, constitute a relatively overt militant reaction by not insignificant forces of big capital to the changes, to the worse, in the conditions of existence on the part of imperialism. Some upside-down logic is at work here that is typical of the imperialist mode of thinking. It claims that, precisely at the end of that ominous confrontation, when the turn came from the cold war to detente, when we were heading toward greater security and important results were being achieved on behalf of normalizing international relations, insuring the national security of imperialist states allegedly became more and more complicated and required an intensified arms race, risky infringements of international law, the heating up of tension and the preparations for military adventures. The imperialist ideologues' and politicians' inability and adventurousness becoming apparent around the security problem reflect the crisis inherent in that social system, with its historic dimensions, and along with it the fact that the class representing it is historically obsolete. How rotten the imperialist system is can be seen by that it is incapable of offering mankind security.

Insuring security for human society today implies unmasking the demagogic rationale for that kind of "security policy," conducting rigorous struggle for continuing the detente process on the various levels of public life, and enforcing in practice the universally valid principles of international law. The most important thing is to set an end to the chief danger to peace and international security, the arms race constantly reheated by imperialism, and to implement effective disarmament measures.

Filled with optimism about the future, and sustained by their great trust in human reason and the role of the broad popular masses in history, the Warsaw Pact states issue this appeal to all nations: "Decisive progress toward stopping the arms race is possible. All efforts must be mobilized for it to become real."²⁹

FOOTNOTES

1. "Declaration by the Warsaw Pact Member States--Adopted at the Session of the Political Advisory Commission on 23 November 1978 in Moscow," NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, Berlin, 24 November 1978.
2. Count W. von Baudissin, "Security Policy in the Detente Process," A. Grosse-Juette and R. Juette, eds., "Entspannung ohne Frieden" (Detente Without Peace), Frankfurt/Main, 1977, p 258.
3. J. Delbrueck, N. Ropers and G. Zellentin, eds., "Gruenbuch zu den Folgewirkungen der KSZE" (Greenbook on the Consequences of CSCE), Cologne, 1977, pp 231-232.
4. FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, 11 October 1977.
5. "Concluding Communique of the NATO Summit Conference of 30 and 31 May 1978," NATO Press Service, Brussels, 31 May 1978.
6. Quote from NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, 23 May 1978.
7. U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, Washington, February 1979, pp 71-72.
8. "Concluding Communique . . .," loc. cit.
9. FRG Ministry of Defense, ed., "Communique of the Ministers' Meeting of the Defense Commission on 5 and 6 December 1978 in Brussels," Bonn, 7 December 1978.
10. "Basic CDU Program as Ratified by the Party Congress, 23 to 25 October 1978 in Ludwigshafen," FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU, 9 November 1978.
11. Cf. Y. Nalin, "Atlantic Legends--NATO Propaganda Against Resolutions of the All-European Conference," IZVESTIYA, Moscow, 12 December 1978.
12. J. Herrmann, "9. Tagung des ZK der SED. Aus dem Bericht des Politbueros an das ZK der SED" (Ninth SED Central Committee Session--From the Politburo Report to the SED Central Committee), Berlin, 1978, pp 11-12.
13. J. K. Galbraith, "Die Tyrannei der Umstaende. Ursachen und Folgen unseres Zeitalters der Unsicherheit" (The Tyranny of Circumstances--Causes and Consequences of Our Age of Insecurity), Bern-Munich, 1978, p 247.
14. G. F. Kennan, "Wolken der Gefahr. Aktuelle Probleme der amerikanischen Aussenpolitik" (Clouds of Danger--Topical Problems of American Foreign Policy), Munich, 1978, p 180.
15. B. N. Ponomarev, "Die lebendige und wirksame Lehre des Marxismus-Leninismus" (The Live and Effective Doctrine of Marxism-Leninism), Berlin, 1978, p 35.

16. J. K. Galbraith, op. cit., pp 386-387.
17. G. F. Kennan, op. cit., p 207.
18. D. S. Lutz, "Is World War II Coming in 1983?" VORWAERTS, Bonn-Bad Godesberg, 16 November 1978, pp 16-17.
19. "Informationen fuer die Truppe" (Troop Information), Bonn, No 5, 1978.
20. AUGSBURGER ALLGEMEINE ZEITUNG, 6 September 1978.
21. "Declaration . . .," op. cit.
22. See also "Energy and Raw Material Problems in Today's Capitalism," IPW-FORSCHUNGSHFTE, Berlin, No 2, 1978.
23. See also L. Maier, "Problems in the Struggle in the Developing Countries for a New International Economic Order," EINHEIT, Berlin, No 6, 1978.
24. "Declaration . . .," op. cit.
25. NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, Berlin, 30 November 1978.
26. "Ausgewaehlte Reden und Aufsaeetze" (Selected Speeches and Essays), Berlin, 1952, p 124.
27. "Speech at the SPD Congress in Mannheim, 23 -29 September 1906," "Ausgewaehlte Reden . . .," loc. cit., p 102.
28. "Declaration . . .," op. cit.
29. Ibid.

5885

CSO: 2300

NEW TYPE OF SMALL PATROL BOAT DESCRIBED

East Berlin VOLKSARMEE in German No 34, Aug 79, signed to press 20 Aug 79
p 8

[Article by Comdr Dieter Rieken: "Small Torpedo-Patrol Boats"]

[Text] The GDR navy possesses three different types of speedboats. are the rocket speedboats and the large torpedo boats with 4 torpedo-launching tubes (both types built in the USSR) and the small torpedo boats (KTS) built in the GDR. The expert ranks these unpretentious escort craft with torpedo armament in the subclass of light torpedo speedboats. They are distinguished from the torpedo speedboats designated as LTS-boats, also produced by the industry of our country, which have been part of the stock of the navy since 1963. With the modernization of these forces of the navy, which operate independently or jointly with other units and allied fleets, account was taken of the fact that torpedo-launching craft are used in many ways. In addition they are in a position to carry out surprise blows. The former LTS boats represented the absolute smallest forces. Among their characteristics are: high speed, great maneuverability, poor detectability due to small size (optically and with radar), proven in the operational zone of the navy. Experts were continually astounded by the severe sea conditions under which these small boats could be used.

Their seaworthiness naturally has limits, as do their range and radius of action. This type of craft also lack anti-aircraft defense weapons, especially for self-defense. The advantages of this small speedboat weapon were so convincing, however, that they have been further developed into the KTS. For the new KTS-boats the builders took over all the advantages, which brought about considerable improvements. An artillery piece was therefore put on board for self-defense. For this they fell back on the small, but reliable twin anti-aircraft gun. Its universality has again been demonstrated; we already know this weapon from the ZSU-23/2 (single axle carriage) and from the ZSU-23/4 (Fla-SFL [anti-aircraft speedboat flotilla] quadruple mount). The other combat sectors also display comprehensive innovations. The radar equipment now permits better navigational course control and reliable sea space observation. It permits combat operations in any visual conditions.

UKW [ultra short-wave] and KW [short wave] stations guarantee a stable communications link between these boats and with command points on land. An order transmission device was also installed on this type of small craft. Externally it can be recognized by the helmets equipped with earphones and microphone, which the crew members wear on board. A stable communication between the commander and the battle stations is thereby insured. This is also guaranteed if the machines are running at full speed and making a considerable noise.

The main mission of the KTS-boats is also the use of torpedos, as with the LTS boats. As in the case of the first type of speedboat, the torpedos are launched to the stern (toward the rear). The torpedo then runs toward the target according to the previously automatically calculated and set values. It is not necessary to aim the boat at the target to be attacked. In order to direct the torpedo into the target, it is fired according to the calculated and preset parameters. Torpedos of varying construction and purpose are used. Launching is possible at top speed. For success in combat the commander needs information on the type of ship to be attacked its speed, length, and draft. The commander must also know the defensive capabilities of this ship in order to overcome the opposing artillery and to direct the torpedo successfully. The high speed of the boats is an advantage in this as well as the low likelihood of recognition, compared with other types of ships. It also considers the good maneuvering qualities and the possibility of camouflage with smoke screens, a relatively slight risk of destruction results.

The torpedo forces therefore represent a weapon not to be underestimated. They have a large share of the high attack and battle power not only of the navy. They are represented also in the Red Banner Baltic Fleet and in the Polish Navy. They ensure the reliable defense of the sea frontiers of the socialist countries in the Baltic.

6108
CSO: 2300

ROPCO ACTIVIST MOCZULSKI CREATES NEW 'POLITICAL PARTY'

'Democratic Confederation' Created

London DZIENNIK POLSKI in Polish 3 Sep 79 p 1

[Unattributed article]

[Text] On Saturday, the anniversary of the beginning of World War II, five of the rightist and Catholic freedom organizations in Poland, in front of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier on the Saxon Square in Warsaw, announced the creation of an independent political party called the Democratic Confederation.

According to information supplied by the BBC correspondent, many hundreds of demonstrators, who had marched to the Saxon Square (currently known as Victory Square) after a festive mass in the Cathedral of St. John, participated in the creation of the new party. A young woman, whose name was not given by BBC, spoke.

The new party is composed of five united freedom groups with a coloration more nationalistic and more rightist than that of the Social Self-Defense Committee "KOR." One of these groups is the Movement for the Defense of Human and Civil Rights [ROPCO].

As is evident from the program declaration which was read, the new party categorically condemns a one-party system and strives for the full independence of Poland, recognizing, however, the need to maintain good relations both with the Soviets and with Germany.

The declaration proclaims that the Democratic Confederation must act within the framework of the law.

The declaration and its justification made mention of the shameful Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact and of the attack on Poland in September 1939.

The speech of the young activist whose name was not given was greeted with shouts and applause. The militia did not react either to the procession from the cathedral to Victory Square or during the rally at the tomb of the unknown soldier.

Reuters informs us that on Friday another Polish freedom group which uses the name Coordinating Committee for National Independence (We translate the name from English) issued its annual declaration, which called upon the leaders of the West to show more interest in the real freedom of Poland and the other nations of Eastern Europe than they had shown during the war and also to date after the war.

Despite Arrests, Rally Held

London DZIENNIK POLSKI in Polish 4 Sep 79 pp 1, 4

[Unattributed article]

[Excerpts] English press agencies and correspondents have given further details concerning the announcement in Warsaw on Saturday of the creation of the first open opposition party.

A procession by around 3,000 people from the Cathedral of St. John to the Saxon Square (now Victory Square), to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, took place in the evening and was very impressive. The people carried torches, sand, and raised shouts. The scene was dominated by a big sign with the name of a new party: "The Confederation for an Independent Poland--our objective is freedom and independence."

The militia was present, but hidden in the side streets, and it did not intervene, although the procession caused major disruptions in traffic on the streets. This was the third open and mass street demonstration by the opposition in Warsaw.

The Reuters Agency states that the Confederation for an Independent Poland (KPN, for short) is the creation of Leszek Moczulski, an activist of one of the factions of the Movement for the Defense of Human and Civil Rights, who was arrested several days ago. Four other ROPCO activists, including Wojciech Zielinski, were arrested on Friday, in the hope that the demonstration planned for Saturday to commemorate the anniversary of the outbreak of World War II, would not take place successfully, but it turned out unexpectedly well.

Reuters reminds its readers that the division in ROPCO took place when Leszek Moczulski attempted to assert dominance over the journal OPINIA, an organ of the movement. A second journal, DROGA, was then created and the movement split in two. An activist of the faction which is in conflict with Moczulski, Marian Golebiowski, has currently stated to the foreign press that he does not take the new KPN political party seriously, because while Poland is not free and the Communist one-party system exists, there is no point in talking about any opposition party.

On the other hand, as we informed our readers yesterday, during the program speech at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier it was declared that the Confederation for an Independent Poland was created from several local freedom groups.

Neither in the leaflets which were handed out during the procession and at the Saxon Square nor in the speech by the KPN activist was there any information concerning in what way the new grouping intends to achieve Polish independence. Attention is also drawn to certain contradictions.

On the one hand, the organizers are not hiding their names and have even given the addresses of the KPN branches in Warsaw, Lublin, and Wroclaw; on the other hand, the program envisages that the party's membership is to be secret. The address of the Warsaw branch is the address of Moczulski's apartment.

Although there were no mass militia interventions, there were arrests. The representative of the British radio station INDEPENDENT RADIO NEWS, Dave Lloyd, was detained for some time by militia agents, together with an English colleague, when they talked with a Polish actor who was one of the demonstrators. According to some reports, the number of preventive arrests of activists on Friday significantly exceeded five.

The Social Self Defense Committee "KOR", which is, as is known, a leftist organization, did not take part in the Saturday demonstration and does not support the creation of KPN. As is known, the entire Movement for the Defense of Human and Civil Rights has a more rightist character and gathers together many Catholic activists.

Seeks End of Soviet Domination

London DZIENNIK POLSKI in Polish 6 Sep 79 p 1

[Unattributed article]

[Text] The Confederation for an Independent Poland, whose creation was announced in Warsaw on 1 September, hopes that its weekly press organ will in spring reach 100,000 copies per edition. So stated its chief spokesman, Leszek Moczulski, in an interview in Warsaw for foreign mass media representatives.

Moczulski delivered to the foreign correspondents a copy of the KPN program declaration; it emerges from it that the new party has given itself the task of creating an independent and democratic republic in Poland. In order to attain this, Soviet domination must be eliminated, and to this end the PZPR must be liquidated.

Other freedom groups do not support the KPN. Correspondents get the impression that even Moczulski's younger supporters have doubts about KPN. Some of them expressed these doubts to the Reuters correspondent.

Moczulski declared that KPN currently is administered by an interim Political Council. He refused to give its membership, explaining that the program declaration was signed by 31 persons.

The task of the Political Council will be to prepare the first congress, which will elect a Party leader. It is still not known when and where this will take place.

Moczulski further declared that two Confederation representatives have already been selected. It is to be represented in London by Maciej Pstrag-Bielinski (We give the name as Reuters gave it), and in Canada by Ryszard Fryg. Their task will be to collect money.

When asked about the origin of KPN, Moczulski explained that it was created by the unification of seven different groups, which with time would, in a multi-party system, be able to transform themselves into a separate party.

He also said that about 40 persons were arrested and detained before the Saturday demonstration on Victory Square, where the Confederation program was announced under the statue of the unknown soldier.

CSO: 2600

FOREIGN POLICY CONCERNS REVIEWED BY FOREIGN MINISTER

Bucharest ERA SOCIALISTA in Romanian No 16, 20 Aug 79 pp 21-26

[Article by Stefan Andrei: "Socialist Romania, an Active Participant in Solving the Great Problems of the Contemporary World"]

[Text] The enormous social and economic changes that have innovatively altered the homeland's appearance, transforming it into a flourishing socialist country, the country's tumultuous social and economic development, the raising of the whole populace to a high level of material and spiritual well-being and civilization, the prestige and appreciation that Romania possesses on an international level, all of the great accomplishments of the Romanian people, under the leadership of their Communist Party, undoubtedly constitute the most brilliant historical justification of the victory of the antifascist and anti-imperialist revolution for national and social liberation in August 1944, the basis for the patriotic pride with which we are celebrating the 35th anniversary of the liberation. The deep historical and political significance of the anniversary consists of the awareness of all citizens of the country that the true unleashing and fruitful utilization of the creative energies of the whole populace were achieved only when, freed from any oppression and exploitation, masters of their fate, sovereign forgers of their own future, they were fully involved in the process of the great revolutionary accomplishments, of the erection of the most just and brightest order, the socialist and communist society, on which the 12th party congress will confer the coordinates of new qualitative accomplishments.

It is the Romanian Communist Party's eternal merit of having given life to the most sacred aspirations of the Romanian people and of having made them a reality. The party represented that consistently patriotic progressive force that, even in the hard years of dictatorship, was able to mobilize the masses of people for struggle, formed the nucleus of organization and action for

accomplishing the great revolutionary act on 23 August, devised with revolutionary clear-sightedness the programmatic orientations and strategic objectives of each stage and firmly guided the historical process of building the new society.

Especially after the ninth party congress, the country's entire domestic and foreign policy, devised under the creative impulse and direct leadership of Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu, the secretary general of the Romanian Communist Party and the chairman of the Romanian Socialist Republic, acquired new possibilities and dimensions, constituting the brightest stage, the one richest in accomplishments, in the whole history of contemporary Romania.

An integral part of the RCP's program for forging the multilaterally developed socialist society and advancing Romania toward communism, its foreign policy is based on the solidity and vitality of domestic development, on the unshakable unity of the whole populace, on the community of its interests and aspirations. Within the framework of the historic effort to construct the multilaterally developed socialist society, Romania has acted and is acting ceaselessly and continually to provide an international climate of calm, of peace, of security and cooperation, essential conditions for development and creation.

The policy of wide international openness of socialist Romania involves the whole spectrum of present world problems and is based on a scientific analysis, in the light of dialectical and historical materialism, of the processes and phenomena that occur in the world, offering a unitary, harmonious view, in complete agreement with the basic interests of the Romanian people, with the realities and requirements of contemporary evolution, of peace, of security and cooperation on the whole planet.

Through his high competence and the great prestige that he possesses everywhere, through the unceasing actions performed in a spirit of high principledness for the cause of the freedom, independence, security and collaboration of the peoples, Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu has made and is making an inestimable contribution to the struggle to solve in a practical way the major problems with which mankind is confronted and to forge international relations of a new type and a world of peace and progress on our planet.

The steadiness and consistency with which Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu makes known and promotes the interests of the homeland and the people, of the cause of progress, of socialism, peace and understanding between peoples, the deep knowledge of international events and phenomena, of the realities in most countries, in all regions of the world, the vast dialog with the leaders of states and governments, with the heads of parties, with representatives of the most different political forces in all corners of the globe, his power of analysis and his ability to formulate on scientific bases the most suitable conclusions and options for practical action—all have given socialist Romania's foreign policy a wide force of influence and an unprecedented rise in the prestige and esteem that our country now possesses in the world. With

good reason, to the pride of our whole populace, the party's secretary general and country's chairman is regarded as one of the most prominent personalities among the great political leaders of the contemporary age.

The fact that Romania now has diplomatic and consular relations with 131 states, as compared with 63 states in 1965, and is developing economic exchanges with nearly all states of the world is an eloquent illustration of the rise in the extent of Romania's involvement in the tumult of international life and the continual expansion of the circle of friends of the country and our people. Moreover, socialist Romania's dynamic presence in the international arena, its active role in solving the great problems of the contemporary world, is based precisely on wide development of relations of friendship and cooperation with all states of the world, on direct and deep knowledge of the concerns of the other peoples and nations, on support for their aspirations of freedom, independence and progress.

Romania has promoted and is promoting steadily a new view about the bases of peace, about the directions in which the efforts must be concentrated in order to achieve true security for all nations and to facilitate fruitful collaboration between them—namely that of strictly respecting in relations between states the principles of national independence and sovereignty, equality in rights and noninterference in internal affairs, mutual advantage and abstention from force and the threat of force. If now these principles are being affirmed more and more as the sole basis on which it is possible to achieve relations of trust and collaboration between states, this is also due to Romania's contribution to their generalization and application throughout international life.

The treaties of friendship and cooperation and the joint solemn declarations—a new category of bilateral instruments with a political and legal character—concluded by our country with countries on all continents establish a framework favorable to the extensive development of Romania's relations with the signatory states. However, what confers on them a special international significance is the fact that—stating in detail the principles that must govern mutual relations and, in consequence, helping to clarify and specify the obligations that devolve upon the states in respecting them—these documents legitimate the promise of the signatory states to also promote the same principles in their relations with other states. If it is considered that Romania has concluded such treaties of friendship and cooperation and joint solemn declarations with over 50 states, it is possible to understand the contribution that these instruments are making to the generalization of the new principles in all international life.

In the center of its foreign policy, the Romanian Communist Party and socialist Romania constantly put the strong development of relations with all socialist countries, intending each act, each measure or action in the relations with these countries to represent a contribution to the creation of international relations of a new type that provide for the unity and collaboration of all socialist countries, factors of great importance in the

development of each country, in the triumph of the general cause of socialism and peace.

The decisive role in the extensive and fruitful development of these relations has been played by the exchanges of high-level visits, the systematic meetings of Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu with the party and state leaders in the other socialist countries and, within this framework, the adoption of agreements meant to lead to the multilateral development of political, economic, cultural and scientific relations and in other fields. The frequent contacts and consultations at different levels along a party and state line and that of the mass and public organisations, the development of economic collaboration within CEMA and with the other socialist countries, the sharing of experience in the process of building the socialist society, and the active cooperation in the field of international life demonstrate the depth and richness of Romania's relations of friendship, collaboration and solidarity with all socialist countries.

Our party and state have stated firmly—and have acted in this regard—that in the relations between these countries the existing problems, regardless of the causes that generated them, must not endanger the friendship and solidarity between them but, with everything being done to strengthen their friendship and collaboration, must be solved by political means, by means of talks, in the spirit of understanding and mutual respect. In conformity with the decisions of the 10th and 11th party congresses, Romania is not following the course of blaming socialist countries and is doing everything to overcome the present states of affairs and to strengthen the unity and solidarity of all socialist countries.

Our party and state feel that the achievement of truly new relations between all socialist countries corresponds the most highly to the real interests and basic aspirations of the peoples of these countries and, at the same time, is of a nature to offer to the states that have stepped onto the path of independent development, to all peoples of the world, a living model and an active stimulus for making a greater contribution to the establishment of a new policy in international life, to the abolition of the policy of domination and dictation, to the affirmation of the ideas of independence and freedom, to the viable resolution of the main problems of today's world, to the cause of detente, security and peace for all nations.

On the initiative and under the dynamic impulse of Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu, the expansion of relations with the developing states and the nonaligned countries has become one of the basic orientations of Romania's foreign policy, with a true qualitative leap being achieved in this field, especially after the 10th party congress. Romania is collaborating with them in the economic, scientific, technical and cultural fields, in the utilisation of national riches, in the formation of personnel, in the development of a proper economy—the basis for strengthening and protecting their independence—seeing in this a component part of the general struggle to promote the cause of the freedom and independence of the peoples and international peace and understanding.

The great number of actions of cooperation and the fact that thousands of Romanian specialists, teaching personnel, medical personnel, and technicians, are performing their activity in these states and about 15,000 young people, the great majority of them being holders of scholarships from the Romanian state, are in school in our country are indicative of the scope of the relations.

In the spirit of peaceful coexistence and of respect for the generally valid principles of relations between states, Romania is developing relations of collaboration with the developed capitalist countries, with all states of the world, regardless of their social order. In fact, the development of collaboration with all countries constitutes an objective requirement of the contemporary world and is dictated by the necessity of participation in the international division of labor, in the world exchange of values, in the consolidation of the course of detente throughout the world.

The view of peace based on principles of law, on relations of trust between states, and not on force of arms and bloc politics, has guided Romania's persevering efforts to build a durable system of security and cooperation in Europe—a chief concern of the policy of our party and state. It can be said that it is now widely recognized and appreciated that Romania made an innovative contribution to the process of detente even under the conditions in which on the European continent there appeared the beginning of the course toward detente, toward the elimination of some of the consequences of the cold war, toward the normalisation of relations between states and the placement of them on new bases. The Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe, whose results were legitimated in the final document signed in Helsinki in 1975 by the heads of states and governments of the participating countries, marked a truly historic event in the life of Europe, exercising in its time a positive influence on the course of international relations on the whole. Through the orientations, principles and measures contained in the final document, the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe acquired a wider political significance, it being the first major international meeting in contemporary history in which the states participated on an equal basis, regardless of size, level of development, or social system, regardless of their membership or nonmembership in military alliances or blocs, thus making a major contribution to the promotion of the process of democratization of interstate relations—an extremely topical requirement regarding the establishment of lasting peace in the world and the fair and just resolution of the main problems of international life.

In the period that has followed, our country has worked actively with the European nations to implement, as a single whole, the final document and has acted to expand the relations of friendship and collaboration with the participating countries and to consolidate the climate of trust and understanding, which would favor the transition to new measures of a nature to offer to all European peoples the guarantee that they are safe from any act of aggression, from any outside interference in their internal affairs.

Starting from the conviction that the meeting in Helsinki constitutes only a beginning in the direction of creating a durable system of security on the continent, Romania has affirmed the importance of continuing the efforts in this direction, the requirement that each participating state and all of them together must not leave things to chance, must not expect the provisions of the final agreement to be fulfilled on their own, but must act decisively and continually to implement all the agreed provisions and principles.

In view of the ending of the meeting in Belgrade in 1977 with unsatisfactory results, Romania feels that there must be a greater effort to increase the rate of the concerns of the European governments for thoroughly preparing for the meeting in Madrid in 1980, so that it gives a new impetus to the process of achieving security and peace on the European continent and, in particular, paves the way for the adoption of firm measures for military disengagement and disarmament—a field in which no effective agreement has been achieved thus far.

It is clear that, under the present conditions in Europe, disarmament and the problem of military disengagement have become decisive. This is strongly demonstrated now, on the eve of the meeting in Madrid, by the fact that, paradoxically, the process of political detente, instead of being accompanied by measures for disarmament, nuclear disarmament in particular, and for military disengagement, is occurring in fact at the same time as an alarming growth of the measures for arming. It is a reality that the biggest arsenals, including the largest quantities of nuclear arms and other modern weapons, and huge military forces have been accumulated on the continent, that foreign troops continue to be stationed and military bases of other states continue to exist on the territory of many European countries and that, lastly, the two most strongly armed military blocs are face to face here. The commencement of the process of disarmament in the field of nuclear and conventional weapons and of military disengagement by the states participating in the Helsinki Conference (which cover more than three-fourths of the military expenditures made on the scale of the whole planet) not only would have a great importance for the European peoples but also would constitute a great contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security.

In view of all these things, in the general European dialog initiated in connection with preparing for the future meeting in Madrid, Romania is speaking out for the organizing of intense consultations both on a bilateral plane and by means of a multilateral, consultative meeting, at a level of political directors or deputy ministers, of a nature to provide the political climate favorable to a constructive approach to the complex problems of the meeting. In addition, we regard as necessary at the meeting in Madrid a suitable representation of the participating countries, at the level of the foreign ministers, that provides for a stronger involvement of the states and, at the same time, confers on the meeting the authority needed to attack and discuss the current, basic problems of the development of collaboration and the achievement of European security and to revive and stimulate the process initiated by means of the Helsinki Conference.

The vastness and complexity of the problems of security and cooperation in Europe strikingly make evident the correctness and topicality of the proposal of Romania and other socialist countries of coming to an agreement on the creation of a permanent mechanism of all states participating in the European conference, an organization that, on the basis of democratic rules and practices, would facilitate the implementation of the agreed measures.

Romania is devoting special attention to the development of bilateral and multilateral collaboration with all states in the Balkans and to the establishment of a climate of peace, understanding and good neighborliness in this part of the world.

This is precisely why, several times, Romania has stressed that it wants to see the organizing of fruitful collaboration on a bilateral and multilateral plane between the states of the region—which could not be interpreted at all as a closed organization or bloc—collaboration that would be oriented toward the resolution of problems of common interest, would be of help in the economic and social development of these countries and would favor the raising of the well-being of the respective peoples and the consolidation of their independence and sovereignty.

In formulating its foreign policy options, Romania starts from a careful analysis of the evolution of international events and phenomena, from a lucid evaluation of the realities of the present and from the drawing of pertinent conclusions for the future. The documents of our party and the writings of Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu point out the complex and contradictory character of the current world situation and bring out the fact that a vast confrontation between two basic trends is occurring in the world at present. On the one hand, against the background of the new phase of the crisis in the capitalist mode of production there are occurring a generalized intensification of the economic, political, national and social contradictions on the scale of the whole globe and an accentuation of the struggle for a new redivision of the world, of the spheres and zones of influence, aggravated even more by the phenomena of crisis in the field of raw materials and energy, by the speedup of the arms race, by the maintenance of serious economic discrepancies and, above all, by the perpetuation of, and even the attempt to justify, the anachronistic and condemnable practices of the old imperialistic policy of force, domination and dictation, of interference in the affairs of other people, which is creating serious dangers for the peace and security of humanity. On the other hand, however, there is noted, for the first time in history, the stronger and stronger growth and affirmation of the will and determination of the peoples everywhere to themselves be masters of their national riches and resources, to themselves determine their path of development, without any outside interference, and to organize peaceful collaboration between them on new bases, under conditions of true equality and fairness. The conclusion of exceptional practical, concrete value that is drawn from this analysis substantiates our party's conviction that it lies within the power of the peoples, acting in union, to block the path of war and aggression, to completely put an end to the imperialist, colonialist,

neocolonialist and racist policy, to cause a radical turn in the direction of a new composition of international relations, in conformity with the commandments of historical progress.

In the spirit of its principled position, Romania has given a special place in its foreign activity to supporting the efforts made on an international level to resolve by political, peaceful means the conflictual situations existing or arising in many parts of the world, on the basis of fairness and justice, in conformity with the requirements for achieving new, democratic international relations, in the interest of the security and peace of all peoples.

Considering that the resolution of vexed questions by exclusively peaceful means represents a requirement of the process of establishing modern relations between all states, regardless of their social order, our country has spoken out consistently for the achievement of a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Romania and Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu are performing an intense activity for continuing the efforts devoted to a complete resolution of this conflict that would provide for the withdrawal of Israel from the Arab territories occupied as a result of the war in 1967 and the regulating of the problem of the Palestinian people on the basis of recognizing their right to self-determination, including the establishment of an independent state of their own and the guaranteeing of the independence and territorial integrity of all states in the area.

Our party and state have made persevering efforts to contribute to the elimination of the hotbeds of conflict in Africa and other parts of the world, on the basis of the principle that all differences, of any nature, must be resolved only by means of talks, with force and armed confrontations being renounced.

The acuteness with which the problem of eliminating the hotbeds of tension and conflict that persist in different parts of the world is posed inspired Romania's new initiative of proposing the putting of a point concerning "The Regulation of the Differences Between States by Peaceful Means" on the agenda of the future session of the UN General Assembly. This initiative is meant to stimulate the finding of ways and means by which the United Nations can play a more and more active role and can make more substantial contributions to solving the basic problems of the peoples, detente, understanding and international collaboration. Romania has already formulated some concrete proposals in this regard, involving the elaboration, under UN aegis, of an international instrument that would legitimate the obligation of all states to resolve their international differences exclusively by peaceful means and the creation of a permanent commission of the UN General Assembly for good offices and conciliation, of a nature to contribute to the regulation and prevention of conflicts between states.

Our party and state regard the forging of a world without wars and without arms as a vital necessity of all mankind, as a historical mission of

socialism and a high duty of the communists, of all progressive and democratic forces, a common cause of all peoples.

In the face of the alarming proportions of the arms race and its trends of continual escalation, in the face of the ineffectiveness of the agreements achieved thus far in the field of disarmament, Romania has not resigned itself to a fatalistic attitude but, on the contrary, has been and is continually in the front ranks of the struggle for disarmament and military disengagement, feeling that all states must assume responsibilities toward their own peoples and must act effectively to achieve progress by stopping the arms race and proceeding to disarmament.

The achievement of disarmament, of nuclear disarmament in particular, is noted as an essential objective in the documents of our party and occupies a leading place in the political thought and the international actions of Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu and in the documents signed on the occasion of high-level meetings and visits. Our party's orientations of principle in this direction have found their concretization in the vast disarmament program adopted by the 11th congress and later presented to the special session of the UN General Assembly.

In the international arena, within the United Nations and other forums, Romania is actively promoting the cause of disarmament, is consistently acting so that in this field there is a transition from declarations to the taking of effective measures for stopping the arms race and for disarmament, for nuclear disarmament in particular, and is working closely with other states for this purpose. As a result of Romanian initiatives, within the United Nations reports have been prepared that point out the profoundly harmful consequences of the arms race for peace and security in the world, for the very life of the peoples, thus helping to mobilize the governments and international public opinion for the cause of disarmament.

Continuing its activity and initiatives at the special session of the UN General Assembly in 1978, devoted to the problems of disarmament, Romania played an active role in the successful concluding of the organizational phase of the new Geneva Disarmament Committee and in the adoption of the elements of a disarmament program on the occasion of the first basic session of the Disarmament Commission, convened on our country's initiative. However, it is necessary that the premises thus created be utilized by means of vigorous, continual and constant activity, by means of continual efforts to stop the arms race and fulfill the desire of disarmament and peace.

To this objective are subordinate our country's proposals involving the initiation of practical measures for freezing the military budgets and proceeding to reduce them by 10-15 percent, for stopping the production and perfecting of nuclear weapons, for destroying the existing stocks, for banning these weapons and for proceeding in an organized and controlled fashion to reduce arming, armaments and armies, there being preserved a balance of power that would not endanger the security and peace of any state.

Of great practical and political importance is the idea promoted by our country that one part of the funds freed through the freezing and reduction of military expenditures and, in general, through the accomplishment of disarmament measures be directed toward the raising of the material and spiritual standard and toward the implementation of development programs of one's own in the countries that reduce their military budgets or proceed to disarmament measures, and another part for supporting the efforts of the developing countries with a view to their faster economic and social progress, for eliminating underdevelopment and the gaps that separate them from the industrialized countries.

In promoting the same objective, Romania is militating for partial measures meant to reduce the sources of tension and conflict through the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of other states, through the elimination of foreign military bases, through the promotion of a firm policy for eliminating the military blocs and for providing real security for all states.

The group of proposals promoted by Romania and its practical activity over the years in the field of disarmament have crystallized a unitary view, profoundly humanistic and realistic at the same time, about disarmament—as a sure way to continually strengthen the course toward detente, security and mutual trust and to achieve the right to peace and disarmament, a basic right, a vital aspiration and a legitimate and justified requirement of all peoples.

In the field of the development and achievement of a new, fair and just international economic order, Romania and Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu have performed a rich activity, marked by original ideas and contributions, based on the results, experience and lessons of economic and social construction of Romania, as a socialist country and, at the same time, a developing country, and on the new principles of equality and fairness that our country is promoting in its economic relations with the other states.

The documents of the 11th party congress, the writings of Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu and his concrete activity outline the value of our country's innovative contribution to clarifying and devising the concept of the new order and, as well, to preparing the measures and programs of action adopted within the United Nations in this field. In view of the decisive role that goes to each country's own effort to eliminate the state of underdevelopment, the view regarding the new international economic order promoted by Romania involves a qualitative, revolutionary change in the economic relations between states, which would be connected with the contemporary political, economic and social realities, a change meant to contribute to the faster development of all states, and especially the lagging ones, to facilitate wide access for the peoples to the gains of modern science and technology, to provide stability to the world economy.

On the initiative of Romania and other developing countries, the decision was made to convene a special session of the UN General Assembly in 1980 devoted

to the new international economic order and to the adoption of measures for the development of international cooperation in the interest of development. The preparation for this special session occupies at present a central place in the concerns of the United Nations. Our country is participating directly in the activities of the plenary committee entrusted with supervising and coordinating the actions and negotiations that occur within the UN system with regard to establishing the new economic order and of the special committee for devising the new international strategy for development in the 1981-1990 decade—UN bodies created in the prospect of the special session.

The message addressed by Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu to the Fifth UN Conference on Trade and Development, which took place this year in Manila, represents a new and remarkable contribution to the efforts made in the international arena to build the new economic order. A major political document of substance, approaching the essential problems of achieving the new international economic order, the message formulates a number of concrete, original ideas and proposals involving effective ways and means of accomplishing the basic objectives of the new economic order—a true program of priorities of action in this field that is enjoying a big response in international discussions.

The series of big international conferences organized under UN auspices with regard to international collaboration in the fields of industrialization, trade and development, environmental protection, food, agrarian reform and agriculture, human settlements, control of deserts, and provision of world water resources and in other fields, conferences in whose organization and preparation Romania has taken an active part, goes among the efforts made on an international level to build the new international economic order. Among them, the World Population Conference took place in Bucharest in 1974, with the participation of over 3,000 delegates from throughout the world, occasioning a striking demonstration of the interconnection that exists between the problems of population and those of development.

This year's new big conference, under UN aegis, devoted to the problems of the use of modern science and technology for the purpose of development, which takes place in Vienna between 20 and 30 August, constitutes a materialization—after thorough debates in the General Assembly and in the specialized bodies of the United Nations—of a Romanian initiative. It is a question of Romania's initiative for putting on the agenda of the UN General Assembly the point regarding "The Role of Modern Science and Technology in the Development of the Nations and the Necessity of Strengthening the Economic, Scientific and Technical Cooperation Between States," an initiative affirmed on the occasion of Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu's participation in the jubilee session devoted to the 25th anniversary of the creation of the United Nations.

Romania's initiatives and its participation in solving the complex problems of achieving the new economic order are occurring under the conditions of the continual strengthening of the solidarity and cooperation with the developing countries, within the Group of 77, and of the growth of the participation of our country, as a guest, in the activities of the nonaligned states. Evoking

the wide development of our country's relations with the developing and non-aligned countries, Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu says: "Romania is continually strengthening the solidarity with these states within the framework of the general policy of struggle against imperialism and colonialism and for the cause of the independence and sovereignty of the peoples, for their right to a free and prosperous life. The struggle for economic and social prosperity, for the strengthening of the independence and sovereignty of the developing countries, of the nonaligned countries, of all states, constitutes one of the essential objectives of socialist Romania's entire foreign policy." The importance of this orientation is evident if we consider the profound changes in the world, the continual growth of the role of the political forces, the continual growth of the awareness of human solidarity and, in general, the growth of the degree of awareness of the world's population through the wider and wider dissemination of information, of culture, and the strengthening of the conviction that peace is indivisible. The holding in Bucharest, between 15 and 17 August of this year, of the ministerial meeting of the developing countries devoted to the establishment of their political platform for the Vienna conference devoted to the use of modern science and technology for the purpose of development is indicative of our country's constant concern for strengthening the solidarity and unity of action of these countries.

Our party and state have militated and are militating for the active participation of all states and people, on an equal basis, in solving the great and complex problems that concern mankind today, demonstrating the important role that goes to the small and middle-sized countries in contemporary international life.

Starting from these considerations, Romania is devoting special attention to the United Nations, as one of the important means for promoting the ideals of freedom and progress, for strengthening peace and security in the world. Like other countries, Romania is concerned with the continual improvement of the organization's activity, taking into account the experience of the 34 years since its founding, for increasing its involvement and influence in solving the problems of international life. Explaining the reasons for this attitude and the necessity of increasing the role of the United Nations and other international organizations, Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu pointed out that "these organizations provide the best organizational framework, under the present circumstances, for the active participation of all states in solving the problems, for the strong affirmation in the world of the principles of international law and the policy of equality between all countries of the world."

One of the objectives of Romania's action in the international arena, under the conditions of the aggravation of the international contradictions, the intensification of the struggle for zones of influence, and the accentuation of manifestations of the policy of force in different regions of the world, consists of the continual activity directed toward strengthening the solidarity and achieving the unity of action of all revolutionary, democratic and progressive forces, toward mobilizing the peoples for the struggle for the

development of the course toward detente, for peace and collaboration between nations, for socialism and democracy in the world. The belief in the capacity of all these united forces to act inspires the confidence in the future that permeates Romania's entire international activity, the confidence in the real possibility of forging a better and righter world, the profound optimism with regard to democratically and fairly solving in the interest of the peoples the major problems of the contemporary world and achieving international relations based on mutual respect, on the new principles of relations between states.

The generous openness toward the future foreshadowed by the draft documents of the 12th party congress and the advancement along the path of forging the multilaterally developed socialist society are creating optimum conditions for even more strongly affirming the organic unity between the domestic policy and the foreign policy of our party and state, with a view to continuing socialist Romania's active participation in solving the great problems of the contemporary world.

12105

CSO: 2700

CRITICISM OF GEOGRAPHY TEXTBOOK REFUTED

Bucharest ERA SOCIALISTA in Romanian No 16, 20 Aug 79 pp 59-60

[Article by Univ Prof Dr Claudiu Giurcaneanu of the Department of Geography and Economic History at the Academy of Economic Studies in Bucharest, in the column "The Word of the Readers": "A Response to Criticism of Textbooks"]

[Text] In issue No 9, 1979, of the periodical, in the column "The Word of the Readers," there was published the material titled "Textbook and the Economizing of Material Resources in the Economic Units," signed by Ionel Dumbrava, in which some aspects of the eighth-grade textbook on the geography of the Romanian Socialist Republic, of which the undersigned is a coauthor, were subjected to criticism.

From the outset, we must note, with positive judgments, the periodical's initiative in publishing some critical comments on, among other things, textbooks, with regard to the way in which they reflect the educational aspect among our school youth, and, moreover, the initiative of readers in composing them.

In this case, those readers who propose to make such criticism must show great care for informing the public as correctly as possible when they are honored with the periodical's hospitality of putting it in its columns. Otherwise, all the good intentions that they may exhibit are ultimately transformed into an act of misinforming the public.

With regard to the criticism made, when he proposed to capture the above-mentioned textbook in his critical viewfinder, Comrade Ionel Dumbrava, whose good faith and civic correctitude we do not dispute for a moment, should have taken into consideration the following obvious realities:

- 1) He should have studied the text of the book thoroughly, page by page and line by line, in order to avoid any erroneous judgments due to a hasty and superficial reading;
- 2) He should have taken into account that his critical reflections were made in 1979 on a textbook appearing in 1977, in which were used data published

officially in 1975, when the problem of the fuel and energy crisis was not so acute;

3) He should have informed himself a little about the basic content that a geography textbook should contain. The problem of the economizing of materials does not lie within the province of geography but of another discipline: industrial technology, for each particular branch. In consequence, the economizing of materials is an aspect of the technological process, regardless of what branch it is a question, and one that is achieved in the course of this process, up to the obtaining of the finished product. However, the geographer is concerned with, among many other problems, the aspects of rational management of all natural resources and the possibility of utilizing them (mineral and water resources, land and biological resources that the natural environment offers us), as a condition for maintaining the ecological balance, problems described thoroughly in our textbook, obviously in terms suited to the power of understanding of children in the elementary eighth grade, within the strict limit of pages permitted for a textbook;

4) Fourth, the reviewer could have realized that all the graphs that illustrate the textbook were constructed on the basis of the official data published in the statistical yearbooks, and the prospects for 1980 on the basis of the documents of the 11th RCP Congress.

In the following, for a fuller explanation of things, let us turn to a concrete analysis of the material.

1. In regard to the lesson on the petroleum industry, the reviewer does not agree when we say that Romania is in one of "the leading places in Europe" with regard to production. In 1975, according to the data published in "Anuarul Statistic 1977" [The 1977 Statistical Yearbook] (p 557), Romania occupied second place on the continent, after the USSR, in petroleum production. Later on, in regard to the graph on production, Comrade Dumbrava seemingly expresses himself with indignation because it depicts "a rapid growth." But this is a reality not only for petroleum production but also for all branches, as an expression of the vitality of the Romanian economy. The graph was prepared from the published official data. Moreover, with the help of these graphs, present throughout the textbook, we make useful and educational practical applications, inviting the children themselves to comment on them.

Also in regard to the lesson on petroleum, the observation is made that we mention nothing about petroleum importation, which is greater than our own production. This finding is indeed valid today, but in 1975, when the data for the 1977 edition were used, crude oil importation was 5,085,000 tons ("Anuarul Statistic 1976," p 397), while production was 14,590,000 tons (the same yearbook, p 113). Petroleum importation did not exceed production either in ensuing years (1976 and 1977) or before 1975.

Regarding the concern that is shown in our country for this wealth, it says word for word on p 112 (1977 edition): "Within this industry, the main

attention is directed toward the careful management of petroleum reserves...." Was the reviewer not able to read these lines?

2. The criticism included for the lesson on petroleum is also repeated for the one on natural gas. The reviewer is wholly displeased because we put Romania in sixth place in the world in natural gas production.

But this can easily be seen from the data published in "Anuarul Statistic 1976," p 511, where Romania is placed after the United States, the USSR, Holland, Canada and Great Britain. And the graph also shows a rising course (see the same yearbook, p 113). Can the reviewer really not imagine that these yearbooks can easily be consulted by the pupils? If illustrative graphs of the growth in production in various branches were not to appear in the textbook on the geography of the homeland, would our pupils not be puzzled and upset? The reviewer thus concludes that through the growth in gas production we are incited to waste. But here too, on p 115, we say: "After 1948, the year of the nationalization of the main means of production, there began a period of use of natural gas as a raw material...." Hence the logical conclusion: the growth in production does not incite us to waste but to sensible use.

The reviewer thus draws a conclusion exactly opposite to the truth stated in the text. In this case, is it possible to accept the educational model proposed by Comrade Dumbrava?

3. In regard to metallurgy of nonferrous metals, the criticism again points to the "strongly rising" rate of our aluminum production. I invite you, Comrade Dumbrava, to consult the same yearbook (1976), where, on p 113, the production of aluminum went from 9,000 tons in 1965 to 204,000 tons in the course of 10 years (1975)!

And regarding nonferrous metallurgy, on p 124, the following is written in the textbook: "Considering that nonferrous metals have a great industrial value, they must be used with great consideration. To this end, the manufacture of high-quality alloys has been undertaken, and for obtaining various less important objects nonferrous metals are replaced, whenever possible, with other materials, like plastic or glass." However, the reviewer did not remember this paragraph either.

4. In regard to the chapter on forests, the criticism seems just as surprising. The reviewer says: the forest "is presented as if there would be no problems regarding the conservation of forests and the supplying of timber."

From the text on p 90 there is reproduced only the idea that deciduous forests occupy three-fourths of the forested area, but nothing of what follows, that is, the concern for conservation.

In explanation, here is the text on p 90. "Forests cover more than one-fourth of the country's area. The most extensive are the deciduous forests

(three-fourths of the forested area), and the rest are coniferous. In the years of socialist construction, better management of the forests was undertaken, primarily through the sparing of the young ones or of those on steep slopes or in the vicinity of the cities. Hundreds of thousands of hectares were afforested, especially in the hilly regions, where the danger of erosion was greater.

"Afforestation was done everywhere with valuable species from an economic viewpoint, such as conifers. In addition, some species of trees brought from other countries, which have good growing conditions here, were introduced.

"In order to protect the forest from the many enemies that it has (fires and some harmful insects) strict protective measures were taken. Fires are also caused sometimes through the negligence of people.

"When you go on a trip, dear pupils, take care to see that you extinguish the fire well, if you have made one during a stop!...

"For preserving and developing the forests, our state approved a law in which wise measures that will be taken by 2010 are provided. The Romanian Socialist Republic is among the few countries in the world that have taken such measures for so long a period."

It is nevertheless astonishing how it is that the reviewer was not able to read these lines.

Later on, it is clearly written on p 129: "Cellulose is obtained mainly from coniferous wood. But in order to save the wood, reeds are also used."

In other parts of the textbook we concern ourselves with good water management (p 82), the application of advanced methods for land use (p 92), the necessity of rational use of energy sources (p 111), the rational use of grazing resources (p 163), the protection of game (p 167) and the protection of nature (pp 184-186). But these remarks too did not enter into the reviewer's objective, they, like the others, being carefully avoided. And finally he also permits himself a conclusion—that after finishing the eighth grade the pupils acquire a */distorted image/* */in italics/* (our italics) of the material resources needed to develop the homeland. Our conclusion to his conclusion, after the above-mentioned things, can be but one: enough said.

In concluding the present response, I want to inform the periodical's readers that this textbook has been in use in our schools for many years, it being fully appreciated by teachers and pupils. Moreover, it has also been appreciated by foreign geographers, it being translated this year in Japan by the "Teikoku-Shoin" Publishing House in Tokyo in a mass printing and under exceptional technical and typographical conditions. We cannot say that the textbook does not have its shortcomings, but by no means those pointed out by the reviewer.

The problem of the economizing of fuel and energy resources is far too important for us to imagine that we can solve it, from an educational viewpoint, in a few phrases in a textbook. As Comrade Ionel Dumbrava points out, all of us, our whole society, the teachers in all specialties and, of course, the family, must be involved in this educational process.

12105

CSO: 2700

CHANGES SUGGESTED IN AWARDING OF LITERARY PRIZES

Bucharest CONTEMPORANUL in Romanian 20 Jul 79 p 10

[Interview with Valeriu Rapeanu, director of the Eminescu Publishing House]

[Text] [Question] With good reason the Writers' Union awards have caused extensive debate among the public. Among other things, the question of the current methods under which the panels of judges operate has come up for discussion. In your capacity as critic and literary historian, as well as director of the prestigious Eminescu Publishing House, what suggestions can you formulate regarding ensuring maximum objectivity in the conferring of the awards?

[Answer] Without a doubt, a discussion of the literary awards, of what the works distinguished by these laurels mean to the development of culture, to the structure of national literature and to the evolution of the work of the author can only be welcomed. Similar discussions have taken place in the foreign press and the conferring of such great awards as the Goncourt, Femina, Renaudot, Interallie, etc. stands out in the mind of the reader and the particular books have a good circulation if the panel considered a genuine value. Let's not delude ourselves, the most prestigious awards in the world, beginning with the Nobel Prize, have on their record both people and works which did not merit such a distinction, as well as numerous incomprehensible omissions, as seen with the perspective of hindsight. We cannot speak of a perfect selection, but of one as close as possible to the contemporary scale of values, to the evolution of literature and to the problems which a culture is dealing with at a given moment. I believe that such a discussion would cause the public response to these awards to be different from what it has been up until now; I am referring namely to the so-called fate of the books, to their circulation and the manner in which they enter into the mind of the reader. Such a discussion must be carried out, nevertheless, with a high sense of responsibility. What I would like to do now is make some suggestions resulting both from a knowledge of the methodology of literary awards in other countries as well as from experience I have acquired having twice been a member of the panel of judges of the Writers' Union. What happens nowadays? The panel meets, deliberates and decides in a single day. It can still meet again in case of a refusal. It's

true that the panel has in its possession the proposals from the publishing houses and creative departments and the publication lists. But the decision belongs to the panel. But, can such a vast and rich literary production be selected and judged in a single day? Especially considering that, unlike other panels which chose from within a single genre (novel, critique), the Writers' Union panel must decide about all genres of literature. Is it possible for someone to render a fully knowledgeable opinion about poetry, prose, journalism, theater, literature for children and young people, translation, first time works? Of course every genre has its representatives, but as I have observed in the case of dramaturgy especially, the decisions are not based on a knowledge of the played or printed dramatic works, but rather on the simple impressions of others. Therefore I believe that, taking the experience of the Goncourt awards for example, the panel should function as an institution which meets a number of times, both retaining and eliminating and making the options known to the general public and the critics. In this way they will be able to see what value these books have, what their specific importance is in a literary year, what directions in the development of literature they represent, what innovations they bring in the context of the evolution of literature, what is their view of the universe and what is the place of a particular author within the structure of a literature. Thus we would avoid unpleasant situations such as occurred this year in poetry and prose--neglecting that which represents the major direction in Romanian literature and awarding prizes to marginal works. I believe that it would lead to an improvement in the current system to establish a specific date for the awarding of the prizes, awarding them on the basis of readings (at least of those which enter into the final selections), considering the opinions of critics expressed up to that time as well as those of the public. Then it is necessary to take into consideration the fact that in Romania a literary prize is intended to encourage and to contribute to the development of certain genres (reports, journalism, etc.) and without causing any kind of reduction in quality this leads to the rewarding of those books which exhibit efforts toward a more open treatment of current events and the urgent problems of our times. A literary prize should constitute an event, but recently I have had the impression that it has not represented the ferment of ideas of our times and through use of the same names it has become the prerogative of a more and more closed circle of people. But the award of the Writers' Union should be a method of encouraging and promoting all genuine values without creating the embarrassing impression that it is not the work that is discussed, but the author, or rather the person. This is how downright painful situations are created, as the fact that Aurel Baranga never received the award of the Writers' Union but only that of the Bucharest Association. I propose, therefore, a broadening of the fields contained within the awards through knowledge (not only on the basis of proposals but also based on readings) of all that which Romanian literature has produced during the course of a year.

[Question] Can directors of publishing houses participate in such panels?

[Answer] As I told you, I was twice a member of the Writers' Union panel (once it coincided with the position of director of the publishing house). Considering the undesirable interpretations that might possibly appear as a result of this situation, this year I declined the kind and flattering invitation that was made to me by the writer Constantin Chirita to be a member of the panel of the Bucharest Association. And I would like to repeat the explanation that I gave to my friend: the publisher is bound to the fate, good or bad, of the books to which he has affixed his name. He has printed them. He is not called on to award or to contribute to the awarding of a prize to a book on whose cover is found the name of the institute which he heads or where he works. In my opinion neither the directors nor other editors of the publishing house should participate as members of the panel. They have printed a book which they are submitting to the judgement of public opinion, of the critics, of the panel. They assume these attributes and responsibilities before publication. Afterwards others should come and say to what degree the publisher's preliminary opinion was correct; others are called upon to compare what they have done. And they, the publishers, draw conclusions after such an objective debate, after such an extensively critical and responsible discussion, that the literary prize will not be the result of an accident or of a varying vote given in a moment of fatigue or in order to please, but with full knowledge of the situation. Therefore, I would maintain that those involved in the fate of a book up to its publication should not be the ones who make conclusions regarding awards, but these awards should be the outcome of selection by an objective panel whose reason for existence for that year is the evolution of literature.

[Question] What suggestions can you offer so that in the future the awarding of the literary prizes will constitute a true event of our culture?

[Answer] I am for the democratic broadening of the discussions of the panel, for the encouragement of the positive trends in our literature, I am against exclusivism and the elimination of persons, so that our entire literary front can be taken into consideration and there will be no names eliminated a priori. The democratization and broadening of the preliminary discussion on the awarding of the prizes should also lead to a resurrection of what we call public opinion, genuine public opinion.

We have no reason to doubt that the improvements that can be brought about by the regulation of the awarding of the Writers' Union prizes will take into consideration the criteria for promoting a literature of value, of authenticity, a literature which the most representative of our writers are publishing today in our country.

CSO: 2700

MEANING OF PARTY MEMBERSHIP VIEWED

Skopje NOVA MAKEDONIA in Macedonian 19 Aug 79 p 2

[Article by Viktor Tsvetanoski: "Membership in the League of Communists"]

[Text] Last year and in the first half of this year alone the SK [League of Communists] organizations accepted 19,000 new members. Therefore, today the SKM [League of Communists of Macedonia] has 125,000 members, more than ever before. We shall not discuss the structure of the new members, the number of workers, farmers, or women...or the membership's national and social structure. Now, when the SKM has considerably increased, several questions arise by themselves: what is the quality of the newly enrolled members, to what extent are the best people joining the SK, and what obstacles are put in the way of those who relate SK membership with their careeristic objectives?

In recent years the other sociopolitical organizations and self-management organs have played a considerable role in the SK organizations and, above all, in the joint efforts. A large number of young members were accepted by the SK on the suggestion of the youth organization, the trade union, or the workers' council which, actually, were best qualified in judging the true activeness of every individual, and follow his involvement with his work and in sociopolitical life.

Nevertheless, and outside such organized steps controlling the acceptance of new members, individuals who do not deserve the party card and whose purpose in joining the SK is the pursuit of separate objectives, join the League of Communists. Some of them, identifying moral-political qualities with SK membership, do everything possible to acquire the red party card and compete for a position of leadership even though we know that the measure of someone's quality is not whether he is a member of the SK alone but the extent of his sociopolitical involvement, his promotion of self management and of SK policy.

Conversely to the obvious presence of some careerists in SK ranks, a large number of model workers, engineers, farmers, and employees remain outside the SK...people whose contribution would have been considerably greater had they been SK members. It is no accident that at the 11th Congress President Tito especially emphasized that "In the case of a revolutionary party such as our League of Communists, the number of members is less important than their ideological-political quality and ability, as a leading force of society, to mobilize and direct the working people in the struggle for socialism."

Therefore, what should be the means for ensuring the necessary quality? How to attract all those who prove themselves in practical life as great fighters for self-management and socialism, concerning this through their personal example? What to do to block membership to all those who express the "wish" to be members but are not for the SK?

The enrollment method used so far involving the recommendation of socio-political organizations and self-management organs appears to be one of the most suitable ways for ensuring true quality. However, it is not the only solution. So far we have been neglecting work with individuals who, by virtue of their personal involvement and direct contacts with noted SK members, could make a considerable contribution to improving membership quality. Quite indicative is the example of a primary SK organization in DOOT which had always justified the low enrollment of new members by citing the insufficient number of workers and their lack of interest and failed to show virtually any result. Yet, whenever the individual SK members have been issued the assignment to follow the work of the active workers and talk to possible membership candidates, results have not been slow in coming. That same organization which had fallen behind for a number of years in terms of membership enrollment doubled in one or two years.

Speaking of membership in the SK, something else must be pointed out as well. In some circles the influence of the SK is not felt adequately. In other words, the primary organizations in such circles have not involved themselves in the real problems of the life of the working people. This has an adverse effect on the workers' interest in SK membership.

SK membership is not a self-seeking aim but a function of changes of relations and conditions which ensure the proper position of a person. That is why more organized and specific steps must be taken in changing the old relations. It is only through struggle and specific undertaking of the solution of existing problems that the SK will be able to acquire the necessary prestige. That is how it will recruit new members and increase its number of workers, farmers and women... Membership for the sake of membership leads nowhere and least of all to progress.

5003
CSO: 2800

PARTY PRESS SCORES VRANICKI BOOK AND 'UNCRITICAL' REVIEWS

Belgrade KOMUNIST in Serbo-Croatian 17 Aug 79 p 11

[Excerpts] For any book which, in the statements of its author, has the intention of being a scholarly work it is a most unenviable fate that some reviewers greet its publication with sterile uncritical apology instead of a fruitful critical relationship. Such is the fate, it seems, of the book "Marxism and Socialism" by Dr Predrag Vranicki which was recently published by the "Liber" press of Zagreb. How else should one describe this "bathos of superficiality" (to use Vranicki's own syntagn) with which this book has been reviewed in some public media.

The rather large collection of overzealous, uncritical terms out of which some reviews of the book have been created would deserve to be possibly in commercial advertisements but certainly not in writings which pretend to be Marxist reviews. Thus, for instance, one daily paper speaks about the fact that Vranicki deals in his book with the problem of Stalinism and after this, concludes: "In order to solve this new enigma of history, Vranicki, first of all, brings out his concept of Marxism."

So here we learn that it is a question in this book of solving an "enigma," but it is known that this enigma has been largely solved already for a long time.

Behind this veneration for the book expressed in some reviews, there is the well-known attachment to that style of review which is written immediately after reading the preface, is made up of long quotations from the book,... and a large dose of excessive sentiment. If this is not enough, then mention is made of other books by the same author. Thus, two reviews in two different papers begin by citing his "History of Marxism."

One review says "'The History of Marxism' is the only coherent and relevant history of Marxist thought up to now in the entire world."

The author of one review [says]: "These lines [of the book], in addition to that which they obviously say, suggest yet another very important matter, namely, that Vranicki did not write his "Marxism and Socialism" in an

apathetic way at all. ...We must be pleased when from the pen of a Marxist with the reputation that Dr Vranicki enjoys we read exceptionally affirmative assessments about our concept of self-management socialism, very pregnant thoughts about the range of its theory and practice."

It is inconceivable for the author of this review to ascribe this [self-management socialism] to the special and exceptional merit of the author of the book, and this at a time when we are preparing to mark the 30th anniversary of socialist self-management here and when many reputable Marxists and progressive theoreticians in general and fighters for social progress in the world have for a long time given affirmative assessments of our concept of socialist self-management. Self-management is as old as socialism and as old as the struggle for socialism.

In fact, all reviews of "Marxism and Socialism" have not been written in the same way. One review in a daily paper mentioned also weaknesses...: "Although the author cites a number of bad examples of Stalinist practice which were largely known from before, it seems that a more serious omission of this study is reflected in the fact that the historical framework of Stalinism is not precisely established and the reader could conclude that Stalinism is the only true solution for socialism in the USSR!"...

This review did not specify all the weaknesses of the book, nor draw the basic conclusions from those weaknesses which it pointed to....

It is not the purpose of this article to deal with the content of this book nor with its conclusions which are not on track with Marxist theory. The following topics, as well as many others, deserve a more basic assessment: Perceiving the revolution as an exceptional action "of the top," and not the historical action of the masses; insisting on the educational role of the intelligentsia in the sense of its partnership with the working class and not in the sense of social commitment of the intelligentsia toward achieving the historical interest of the working class; failing to understand socialism as a world process and the differentiation of roads in socialism; placing in quotation marks the idea of a socialist country, i.e., the subjectivistic denial to many countries of their socialist character; tendency toward some kind of Euro-centrism, thus a lack of understanding of the new, present-day, incomparably broader possibilities of socialist change in those countries which have achieved independence in the great anti-colonial revolution, and a projection of the future development [of these countries] which hardly leaves these countries the possibility of avoiding bureaucratic-etatistic deformation. Here we only want to point out that it is illogical to by-pass all this in reviews which intend to be objective and reflect a spirit of criticism. It is just as illogical to bypass the dogmatism contained in the author's thesis to the effect that he, in his new book, is the discoverer of final truths. If reviews turn their back on all this, then they can hardly be called reviews..., but rather commercial publicity which has nothing in common with Marxist criticism.

Sometimes superficiality, ignorance, or laziness of spirit is the cause of such uncritical reviews. And perhaps the following conclusion of the author himself has contributed to this, where he specifies the measures of value of his own book... in this unusual way: "There are different books written from different motives and with different scope. There are also those which are fatally linked to personality and to the history in which they arose, to the most intimate instincts, desires, and hopes; I believe that this is one of the essential characteristics of this work of mine."

CSO: 2800

CONTROVERSY SURROUNDS ANTHOLOGY, LINGUISTIC STUDY

[Editorial Report] Two critiques of a seemingly innocuous literary anthology in Zagreb OKO in Serbo-Croatian No 187, 17-31 May 1979, page 4, have served to set off a summer of heated controversy, demonstrating once again how easily deep wounds can be reopened in the Serb-Croat tensions so close to the surface of Yugoslav public life.

The critiques, by Stanko Pekec and Ivan Salecic, savagely attack "Literary Reader: from the Cultural Patrimony of the Serbian People in Croatia" ("Knjizevna hrestomatija," Zagreb, Prosvjeta publishing house, 1979) for chauvinism. Pekec and Salecic describe the anthology as overfull of Serbian Orthodox clergymen, Habsburg army officers, and low-grade politicians while omitting communist revolutionaries. The two critics also ridicule references to the "tragedy of the Serbian people" and the idea that Serbs are somehow specially "threatened."

Three defensive responses occupy two pages of the next issue of OKO (No 188, 31 May-14 June 1979, pages 8-9). Of the three, Milan Radeka's is the most striking. Radeka first sketches the background of the book's chief editor, Stanko Korac, a war orphan whose father perished along with the rest of the local Orthodox folk in the fires of the Serbian church at Glina (Radeka does not need to tell his readers the details of one of the best-documented atrocities of World War II), who earned a doctorate in literature at Zagreb University with a dissertation on turn-of-the-century Croatian literature and has published a book on the interwar Croatian novel ("one might ask him instead why he did not remember earlier to work on something in the area of his own folk"), who was rector of the pedagogical academy in Karlovac until it was abolished, and who has been essentially unemployed since then with the exception of a brief stint as secretary of the "Prosvjeta" Serbian cultural society in Zagreb until it was "put on ice" (Radeka does not need to tell his readers that this organization was criticized for presuming to defend Serb interests during the upsurge of nationalism in Croatia in 1970-1971). The rest of Radeka's page-long outburst borders on the hysterical. Since his basic argument is "you're another," Radeka dredges up all Serb resentments over political events in Croatia from the postwar era and earlier, jumping back and forth: the "Declaration on the Croatian Literary Language" of 1967, the forced

linguistic differentiations of wartime, attempts at assimilation and standardization, the number of Serbian Orthodox priests massacred in Croatia ("piles of bones"), the need to develop the underdeveloped areas of Croatia in which Serbs comprise the majority. In his worst moment, Radeka equates Pekec's distaste for "Orthodox consciousness" with wartime Croatian leader Ante Pavelic's definition of Serbs in Croatia as "Croatian Orthodox citizens." In conclusion, Radeka ironically thanks the critics for publicizing this unassuming volume--"obstinacy also plays a role in our circles."

In the same issue of OKO (No 188), the editors had announced that responses would be forthcoming from Pekec and Salecic in the succeeding issue. A brief, dignified response from Salecic indeed appears in the latter (No 189, 14-28 June 1979, page 9), but nothing from Pekec. The editors regret their inability to print Pekec's remarks "because of emotional shadings that are at variance, in our opinion, with the correctness of his arguments."

The editors of OKO, usually eager to keep polemics going as long as possible, had plainly lost their stomach for the whole business by the next issue (No 190, 28 June-12 July 1979, page 4). The editors describe most of the responses as "going beyond the bounds of literature and literary history... attempting to shift the focus of the dispute onto the area of interethnic relations." Some of the texts received are said to "proceed from, or conclude with, political standpoints that seem to us unacceptable... the polemic has become overheated." One can only guess at what harsh and incautious missives must have crossed the editors' desks to impel them to the euphemistic blandness of their brief statement.

In the meantime, another polemic was starting up in OKO (No 189, 14-28 June 1979, page 4) over a second book published by the Prosvjeta publishing house of Zagreb in conjunction with the "Matica srpska" society of Novi Sad, a study of the dialect of the Banija and Kordun regions of Croatia where Serbs have formed the majority of the population for centuries ("Govor Banije i Korduna," 1978). Prof Dragoljub Petrovic of Novi Sad, the author, would indeed seem to have been asking for trouble if he chose to dedicate this work of scholarship to the "memory of Saint George's Day of 1941 in Voljun and Saint Elijah's Day of 1941 in Glina," i.e., two massacres of substantial numbers of noncombatant Serbs.

Petrovic's chief fault in the eyes of the reviewer, Rade Peles, was to append verbatim texts of folk speech, transcribed from tapes or notes to illustrate linguistic generalizations. In these frank passages, elderly women refer to the unwillingness of Serbs to marry Croats and evoke memories of massacres: "When I see this person named Nogic, or hear something about him, I remember that his grandfather killed my own father." One elderly woman is so politically insensitive as to describe wartime, without reference to partisan efforts, in these terms: "Well, forty-one, forty-two, that the worst time, after that it was a little easier, things got a little stronger..."

Professor Petrovic attempts with little success to fend off his attacker in a subsequent issue of OKO (No 191, 12-26 July 1979, page 8). In any case, in a jab at balance and objectivity, Peles does acknowledge the neglect of Serb dialects in Croatia by Croatian scholarship, and we are indebted to him for an instance of the monumental pettiness to which chauvinism (Croatian in this case) can sink. According to Peles, when oversize loads were being trucked from the port of Rijeka for the construction of the Krsko nuclear power station, the Croatian road administration kept announcing the closing of the roadway between Skrad, "Goranka" tavern, and Stubica. The reference to the tavern was presumably a way of avoiding the adjective "Serbian" in the place name Srpske Moravice, the townlet in which the tavern is located.

CS0: 2800

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

24 SEP 79

WB